

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. patent application. Claims 15-18, 28, 31 and 33-35 have been allowed. Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 19, 20, 24 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 19 and 30 have been amended. Claim 22 has been canceled. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 15-20, 23-28, 30, 31 and 33-35 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Specifically, claim 30 depended from a canceled claim. Applicant has amended claim 30 to depend from pending claim 28. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejections of Claims 19, 20, 24 and 27 based on Yao in view of Augusto

Claims 19, 20, 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2003/0111675 filed by Yao (*Yao*) in view of U.S. Patent Application 2005/0167709 filed by Augusto (*Augusto*). For at least the

reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that claims 19, 20, 24 and 27 are not rendered obvious by *Yao* in view of *Augusto*.

Claim 22 includes allowable subject matter and thus is not rendered obvious by *Yao* in view of *Augusto*. See Office Action, page 5, paragraph 5. Applicant has amended claim 19 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 22. Consequently, claim 19 as amended is in condition for allowance. Thus, amended claim 19 is not rendered obvious by *Yao* in view of *Augusto*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 20, 24 and 27 depend from claim 19. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 20, 24 and 27 are not rendered obvious by *Yao* in view of *Augusto* for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 19. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 20, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-18, 28, 31 and 33-35 have been allowed. Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As stated above, claim 19 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 22. Claim 22 has been canceled. Claims 23, 25 and 26 depend from claim 19. Therefore, Applicant submits that although not rewritten in independent form


to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claims 23, 25 and 26 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 15-20, 23-28, 30, 31 and 33-35 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 15, 2006



Joseph A. Pugh
Reg. No. 52,137

TriQuint Semiconductor, Inc.
2300 NE Brookwood Parkway
Hillsboro, OR 97124
(503) 615-9616